ORIGINAL

E. 5
10/5/94

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

- -

In the matter of:

ALBION-SHERIDAN TOWNSHIP LANDFILL SUPERFUND SITE

- -

H E A R I N G

October 5, 1994
Albion Public Library
501 South Superior Street
Albion, Michigan

Appearances - HEIDI VALETKEVITCH, USEPA, Community Relations Coordinator

LEAH EVISON, USEPA, Remedial Project Manager, Office of Superfund

JIM MYERS, MDNR, Project Manager/Superfund Section

JOHN FILPUS, Michigan Department of Public Health, Division of Health Risk Assessment

LIZ BARTZ, Earth Tech

Recorded by - NETWORK REPORTING CORPORATION
Susan J. Warner, CER-1386

MS. VALETKEVITCH: I'd like to welcome you all on behalf of the United States Environmental Protection Agency. We are here to discuss the Albion-Sheridan Township Landfill Superfund site, which is in Albion. My name is Heidi Valetkevitch, and I work for the USEPA as a community relations coordinator. I'd like to make some introductions; Leah Evison, who is the remedial project manager at EPA, Jim Myers from the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, John Filpus, from the Michigan Department of Public Health and Liz Bartz, from Earth Tech, a contractor for USEPA. Yes?

AUDIENCE: All these names go by me so quickly. Could you provide a print-out sheet so that we know who the speakers are going to be?

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Well, actually, on the back of the fact sheet, there's a list of names -- actually, on the blue sheet. It's provided by the Michigan Department of Public Health, and there's some names, as well as the gray fact sheet, on the back sheet. And we all have name tags on.

AUDIENCE: Can we go over the names again one more time so I can record these?

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Sure. I'm Heidi Valetkevitch from EPA. That's on the gray sheet, or you could look on the agenda, too. Leah Evison from EPA, Jim Myers from the

Michigan Department of Natural Resources, John Filpus from the Michigan Department of Public Health. He's on the agenda and the blue sheet. And Liz Bartz works for a contractor called Earth Tech that's working for USEPA.

The topic for tonight's discussion is the proposed plan for cleaning up the four areas of concern at the landfill, which are the hazardous and liquid waste drums within the landfill, the current landfill cover, landfill gases and groundwater contamination. USEPA will also present its recommended clean-up plan for addressing this site.

Leah will discuss the background of the site, the past studies that were conducted at the site in the last couple years and the proposed clean-up alternatives. John Filpus will discuss the State Public Health role at the site. A question and answer period will then begin. I'd ask you to hold all your public comments until we get through the question-and-answer period so everyone can understand what we're discussing here and they can get all their questions -- although if you do have to leave early and you need to make a public comment, please go ahead and do that. Once all the questions are answered, then we will begin the public comment period. Comments provided to the EPA are very important. We will not make any decisions until all comments are considered.

As you can see, we have two court reporters taking down the minutes of the meeting. USEPA will respond to each comment in a document called a Responsiveness Summary, which will be added to the information repository that's already established here at the library. A public comment period for this site began October 3rd and lasts for 30 days unless an extension is granted. Extensions grant the public an additional 30 days. All you have to do is ask for an extension, and we'll take that into consideration and most likely grant it. Comments are accepted in written or in oral form. There are public comment forms in the back, actually in the gray fact sheet. There's a sheet that you can hand that to me tonight, you can make an oral comment, or you can send it to me in the mail by November 2nd. All comments must be postmarked by November 2nd of this year. When making an oral comment, please remember to state your name. If it's a difficult name, like Valetkevitch, my name, I'd ask you to spell it out so that the court reporter can accurately take it down who said what and all your public comments.

For those of you who are not familiar with the Superfund process, let me briefly go over what it is. This is similar to the poster in the back. A preliminary investigation of the site is conducted by EPA in the state. If the site poses an actual or potential threat, the site

is placed on something called a National Priorities List, which is a roster of the nation's worst hazardous waste sites. Then a two-part study is conducted. The first part is a pollution study called a remedial investigation, and that identifies the contamination and the site-related threats to public health and the environment. A feasibility study is then conducted and evaluates various approaches to addressing site conditions. USEPA then presents its recommended clean-up plan, and we have a public comment period.

That's where we are tonight. After that, after considering all public comments, we sign something called -- it's a legal document, really, called a Record of Decision. The Responsiveness Summary will be attached to the Record of Decision, which the Responsiveness Summary again is a response to all your comments that you will give tonight.

Then, after we select the clean-up plan, sign the legal document, we have a remedial design, which is basically working out the engineering plan for the site, and then we have remedial action, which is actual construction and cleaning up the site. And that's it. I just would like you all to sign in on the sign-in sheet. That's how we make you aware of these public meetings and keep you up to date of future actions at the site. And

thank you.

MS. EVISON: As Heidi mentioned, I'm Leah Evison, the project manager for this Albion-Sheridan Township Landfill Superfund site. Can I have the first overhead. Before answering your questions tonight, what I'm going to do is briefly summarize the history of the site, what we found in the remedial investigation, starting with the landfill itself and then moving out to the surrounding environment and then briefly summarize the clean-up options that we developed and recommend the options that we think are best. As most of you know, the Albion-Sheridan Township Landfill is about a mile east of the city here, between Michigan Avenue and Erie Road. It's about 500 feet north of the north branch of the Kalamazoo River. The landfill there in red covers 18 acres --

MR. BUINOWSKI: Can I make a comment please? Why is it they've got that showing on that map in Jackson County? It don't belong in Jackson County. The map is incorrect, so already we're off to a bad start.

MS. EVISON: There may be some inaccuracies in the map drawings --

MR. BUINOWSKI: We're not doing our homework somewhere along the line. It isn't right. If they can't draw up a map and show where the doggone thing is correctly, what are we listening to here, some rigmarole that -- I feel

disappointed that they haven't corrected that. They've had this out for weeks. Do you mean to tell me nobody ever called it to your attention?

MS. EVISON: We'll take your comment into consideration and make --

MR. BUINOWSKI: Well, all right. Go ahead.

MS. EVISON: The landfill is surrounded by residential and commercial property. To the east is the Amberton Village Subdivision, over in this area; to the west, the Orchard Knoll Subdivision, and there are residences in other areas around the site to the south and especially here to the southwest.

The landfill began operation in 1966. And the next overhead shows some of the wastes that were accepted by the landfill. It accepted municipal refuse and a variety of industrial waste from the surrounding area, and some of these include scrap metal and wood, metal plating sludges, paint wastes, casting sand and used oil and grease, among others. The landfill was closed by the State in 1981 and was listed as a Superfund site in 1989 due to concern about the industrial waste in the landfill.

In 1990, about 40 drums were removed from the surface, and some of those contained hazardous wastes. In 1992, EPA and the State began the remedial investigation. So now I'm going to summarize what we found, starting with the

landfill itself. This is a cross-section of the landfill with the hilliness of the land surface exaggerated. This is the landfill mass here, shown here in red. This is the Kalamazoo River here. In blue, underneath the landfill are about 20 to 40 feet of loose sands and gravels and silts, and underlying that is the Marshall Sandstone. It's solid rock but highly fractured.

We found that the landfill is up to 35 feet thick, and there's a layer of sand covering most of the waste. In the landfill, sampling the solid wastes, we found low levels of a number of contaminates, including volatile organics and semi-volatile organics, pesticides, PCB's and arsenic. And in the liquid at the base of one of the holes drilled through the landfill, we found low levels of benzene, nickel and vinyl chloride. Now, I'm calling those levels low, but they are above federal drinking water standards. During this past summer, the Michigan Department of Natural Resources dug a number of shallow holes in the surface of the landfill looking for drummed waste, and they found one area that contains about 200 drums of waste, some of which is hazardous.

So now I'm going to move out from the landfill out to the surrounding environment, starting with the groundwater. This is a map of the landfill and the monitoring wells that we sampled. The outlined area, outlined in red, is the

landfill itself. And the dark green spots show a series of 31 monitoring wells that are spread around the landfill. Some of them are right next to each other at different depths, up to 100 feet. These wells helped us to determine that ground water flows mostly to the southeast, in this direction of this arrow, underneath the landfill.

We also sampled residential wells surrounding the landfill and looked at the results from the Amberton Village water supply well and some of the monitoring wells over here in the Orchard Knoll area. We found that none of the residential wells are being affected by the landfill at this time. However, there is a plume, or an area of groundwater which is affected from the landfill that extends out to the southwest. In this area here, we detected a number of organic and inorganic contaminants at low levels, in the parts-per-billion range. There was one contaminant, only one, that did not meet federal drinking water standards, and that contaminant was arsenic.

These lines show the concentration of arsenic to the southwest of the landfill in micrograms per liter, which is more or less parts per billion. In the highest samples, here shown in dark blue, the level of arsenic exceeds the federal drinking water standard, and at the very center here, it exceeds it by about two and a half times. If this ground water here in that dark blue area were used for

drinking water over a long period of time, it would present an increased risk of cancer of about 2 cases in 1,000 people, and it could also have toxic effects. Some of that arsenic is probably coming from that landfill, but we think that another source is the bedrock itself under that area. The Marshall Sandstone contains arsenic minerals, and ground water pumped out of it in many different areas contains low levels of arsenic naturally. We think what's happened here is that as the ground water percolates through the landfill, it changes the chemistry of the water in a way that allows the arsenic to be loosened from the rock and go into solution into the ground water. However, as the groundwater flows deeper or further away from the landfill, it becomes more oxidized, and the arsenic goes out of solution and is no long present in the groundwater.

So continuing the investigation, we also sampled soils, river water and river sediments. And this, real briefly, summarizes the results. We sampled soils in areas where wind or water could carry contaminants from the landfill, and we sampled surface water and sediments from the river and the marsh areas near it. We detected a few contaminants in each of these areas, but the health risks associated with them are very low. We also conducted a preliminary ecological assessment in the area, and we do not think that the landfill is adversely affecting the

habitats or the wildlife of the area.

Next I'm going to summarize some of the clean-up options we developed for the site and recommend the options that we think are best. The criteria we used to make our recommendations are explained in the proposed plan fact sheet; that's the gray one. So we developed clean-up options for different areas of the site which are listed here. First we considered what would happen if we did nothing more at this site, what we call the no-action option. If we walked away from the site now, water would continue to percolate through the landfill, corroding drums and carrying a variety of hazardous wastes into the groundwater. This is not an acceptable option to EPA or to the State. So the areas that we developed clean-up options for are the drums, the landfill caps, the gas and the groundwater. And I'm going to go through each of these, in turn, first presenting the option that we're recommending and then mentioning the other options we looked at.

For the landfill, for the hazardous and liquid waste drums that were located by the MDNR, we recommend that they be removed and treated off-site. We also recommend removal of other drums of hazardous or liquid wastes that are found as we construct the cap. We estimate that a total of about 200 drums would need to be removed, and the cost would be about $600,000. That covers removal, treatment and

disposal off-site.

This is a diagram of the landfill cap that we're recommending. The waste is down here, and on top of the water would be a layer of sand to help with gas collection. On top of that would be a flexible membrane liner, and this is the most essential part of the cap. It stops the percolation of rainfall through the landfill. On top of that, there would be cover soil to protect the liner and sand and top soil to allow grass to grow and run-off to leave the landfill without eroding it. We estimate the cost of this cap we're recommending at about $1.9 million.

We also evaluated two other caps for the site. These were clay caps using compacted clay instead of a flexible membrane liner. The first we evaluated is one that meets the minimum requirements for household waste landfills. And the second is one that includes some better protection against frost cracking. One of these caps, the first, was slightly cheaper than the one we're recommending and the second slightly more expensive. But we recommend the flexible membrane liner cap because it's effective at stopping infiltration. It isn't as susceptible to frost cracking as the clay caps and because construction of it will involve less truck traffic than the clay caps.

For the landfill gas, these are gases that are generated by decomposing waste in the landfill. We

recommend a system of pipes that would be constructed as part of the landfill cap to collect the gases, pump them to central points where they would be treated by flaring, which burns off the volatile compounds, and the cost of that gas system would be about $700,000.

We also evaluated passive venting where gases are vented to the atmosphere, and the cost of that would be about $300,000. Now, if studies during the design show that there are very few gases generated by the landfill and they could be safely vented, then we might approve that type of option.

So now, moving out from the landfill itself to the groundwater, for the groundwater, we recommend regular sampling of about 20 monitoring wells, some which exist now and some which would be new, and these are shown in green around the site. These wells would be sampled both for arsenic and for other contaminants. In addition, we recommend that the nearby residential wells and the Amberton Village water supply well be sampled four times a year to make sure they remain safe.

MR. LAMPART: How deep are the wells, on an average?

MS. EVISON: They range from, say, 10 feet to 100 feet, the monitoring wells. The residential wells, some of them are deeper than that. So they're monitoring -- we found that the contaminants, the arsenic plume, was

concentrated in the shallow bedrock where it's more fractured, and as the groundwater moves deeper, the arsenic is no longer traveling with the groundwater. It's reattached to the coatings on the rocks because it becomes more oxidized away from the landfill.

We think that after the landfill cap is constructed, the arsenic near the landfill will begin to leave the groundwater just as it does now further away from the landfill. We estimate that it will take about 15 years for the groundwater near the landfill -- that's right here -- to clean up to drinking water standards. We recommend that monitoring continue after that time also.

The next overhead summarizes this monitoring option and the other groundwater option. The monitoring that I've talked about, over a period of 30 years, would cost just over $1 million; however, we recommend a second option, a back-up plan. If the natural groundwater clean-up is too slow or, for some reason, doesn't work, we recommend that in five years we evaluate all the monitoring data, determine if the natural clean-up is happening as fast as we predicted or not. If it's not, we recommend the clean-up method called in-situ or in-place treatment. This would use a system of small wells to pump air or some other oxidizing agent into the groundwater to speed up the process. The treatment would continue until groundwater

meets the federal drinking water standards. The estimated cost of that would be about $1.9 million, which includes the cost of monitoring, since that would have to continue also. We also considered two other options for cleaning up the arsenic, in-place treatment to a more stringent clean-up level, which would cost about $2.9 million, and we considered pumping the water, treating it above ground and discharging it, perhaps to the Kalamazoo River, for a cost of about $2.7 million.

So, to summarize the recommended remedy for the Albion-Sheridan Township Landfill, we recommend removal and treatment of the drums that contain hazardous or liquid waste, we recommend we construct a flexible membrane liner cap, we recommend active collection and flaring of the landfill gas and that we monitor the natural clean-up of the groundwater for five years. After that, if it's not working, we require in-place treatment until the drinking water standard is met. John?

MR. FILPUS: My name is John Filpus. I'm with the Michigan Department of Public Health, Division of Health Risk Assessment. Our division works with the federal Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, ATSDR. We are charged with preparing documents for public health assessments for Superfund sites nationwide. Our division, under the contract, does use federal assessments for all

sites within the state. We've been involved with the Albion-Sheridan Township Landfill since 1990, and we prepared what we called a Preliminary Health Assessment. A copy is available for review in the EPA repository here in the library, and I have a few with me if you wish to take one home. We are in the process of updating the preliminary assessment based on the information gathered during the RI, the remedial investigation. And that document, which we called a public health assessment, will be ready for the public review and comment in a couple of months.

We also had at the back table little fact sheets that summarize our department's current understanding of health risks associated with the landfill site. The health assessment will go into much more detail than either of these documents did, and we will put it out for public comment as on the document before we finalize it.

One thing to clarify is that public health assessments are different documents from the risk assessments put out by the EPA for their remedial investigation program process. Public health assessments also address health concerns of the community on the site and the hazards from the contamination in the environment. Basically, any comments, information regarding the site are welcome at any time, even outside the formal comment period. That's what

I'm here tonight -- if anybody has health-related questions during the meeting, I will attempt to answer or pass it on to people with the appropriate knowledge back in the Department, and we will get back to you. Addresses and telephone numbers are listed on the blue fact sheet. Yes?

MR. LOPEZ: My name is Bob Lopez. I'm a resident of Sheridan Township. You represent the Department of Health for the State of Michigan?

MR. FILPUS: Yes.

MR. LOPEZ: Do you keep -- your health department keeps statistics of the types of cancers that are in this area and illnesses or whatever? And the reason why I ask that is that we have so many contaminant sites in the greater Albion area, probably within a mile radius of all this. In addition, we have -- how many Superfund sites do we have?

AUDIENCE: Six.

MR. LOPEZ: Six Superfund sites. This is just one of them. And what I'm really concerned with is what kind of cancers are coming from this particular area? People who live here -- you know, through the industry pollutants and so forth and past sins -- do you carry those statistics here? I think that's vital for our area.

MR. FILPUS: Yes, we do have cancer statistics. The Office of the State Registrar does amass -- does keep

cancer statistics. In fact, our public health assessment which is coming out includes an analysis of the statistics for -- unfortunately, the smallest area we could get was a zip code area, covering Albion all the way out to Amberton Township and the surrounding area. And our numbers come up, on that large a basis, no worse than anywhere else in the country, not discernably different; if anything, fewer cancers than you would expect, based on nationwide statistics.

MR. LOPEZ: So your raw data shows that?

MR. FILPUS: Yes.

MR. LOPEZ: Okay. Where can we get this raw data so that we can look at it, the public? I know it's in process, you said.

MR. FILPUS: Yes. That document is in process. I'd have to talk -- give me your name and address, and I will send you what I can on that basis.

MR. LOPEZ: How many here would be interested in this raw data?

(Showing of hands)

MR. LOPEZ: So make sure you sign a slip for him so we can have that at our disposal. Thank you.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: We'll start the question-and-answer period. We've already sort of started it. I'd like to open it up for any questions and answers.

MS. PENNOCK: What are the risks of those barrels breaking or leaking when they're trying to remove them, and how do they go about removing them so that doesn't happen, especially if they're all buried close together? Two hundred to 400 barrels is quite a few.

MR. MYERS: During any sort of barrel removal that we'd perform, special care would be taken to avoid that, but we would provide measures -- what we call a staging area -- you know, once we remove the barrel, to sit that on the ground, and once a buried barrel is removed, it's placed in another drum, which we call an over-pack drum. That barrel, obviously, is brand new and considered much more stable than any sort of barrel that's in place which may be corroded to a certain extent. During any removal action, there is always the risk that one of your barrels might be compromised and some liquid or solid waste might leak out. In that event, the soils surrounding that or underneath that would also be excavated, and that soil would be put into an over-pack drum, and that would be disposed of also as a hazardous waste.

MR. LOPEZ: Bob Lopez. I'm concerned about migration. It's been a little while since you did your studies with the well drilling and so forth there. What causes migration of contaminants to happen that could accelerate it over a period of time? Is there anything that might be

there that we don't know about?

MS. EVISON: I presume you're mostly talking about groundwater migration, since that's where the contaminants are here.

MR. LOPEZ: Yes.

MS. EVISON: The rate of groundwater flow does change seasonally a little bit. The measurements we've taken have been in different seasons over the last several years, so we have some handle on what the range of movement is. Actually, if you recall, the contaminants are located within, let's say, 600 feet of the landfill. That's where most of the detectable arsenic is. The groundwater itself in the shallow bedrock is moving about 40 feet per year through that area. So the groundwater continues to move through that area but does not carry the arsenic further downstream. And the answer (sic) is, why not? We've sampled further down-gradient or downstream, and it's not there anymore. That's what leads us to believe that even though the groundwater is moving through there, the chemical environment is changing as the groundwater moves further away from the landfill and the arsenic goes out of solution. Does that --

MR. LOPEZ: Yeah. I have other questions, but let other people -- it gives me some idea.

MS. BARTZ: I think -- I may be wrong, but during the

remedial design, I think we would call for a round of water samples.

MS. EVISON: Definitely, yes, to give it time to kind of --

MR. LOPEZ: Right; I know you mentioned that. But I was thinking about the rate so far, and will it go further than where you have the wells already done right now, you know?

MS. EVISON: Just before the design were implemented, there would be a full round of sampling to make sure that we're putting those final monitoring wells in the right place and we're not losing anything.

MR. FILPUS: The monitoring wells are spaced far enough out from the site that they do not -- the outermost ones do not get contamination.

MR. LOPEZ: In other words, have you done a well away from it where there is no apparent contamination so that you can go back to see if there's migration up to that point? This is what I'm wondering or concerned about.

MS. EVISON: Yes.

MR. LOPEZ: Okay. That's part of your drilling and so forth of test wells?

MS. EVISON: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: Lawrence Taylor. I'm a geologist, a professor at Albion College. And I've had a chance to

review the report that Earth Tech has made of the landfill, and I have some questions which I think might be of interest to the community. Some of these questions I have had answered to me personally, but it might be of interest to everybody here.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Go ahead.

MR. TAYLOR: One of the questions deals with the analyses that were made of the landfill itself. There were three sampling wells placed in the landfill, and they all detected quite low levels of contaminants in the sampling sites. And the question is, considering the history here of industrial waste disposal, which is nicely summarized here in the background information, which includes metal plating sludges, other materials such as paint wastes and thinners, oil and grease and dust and dirt containing fly ash and so on, considering the history here of the kinds of contaminants that were dumped in this landfill, it seems that these sampling sites certainly haven't picked up any high levels of these contaminants, based upon the analyses that were made. So one of my questions is, why are these sites at such a low level? I'm glad to see that, I mean. It's encouraging to note that they haven't picked up these real high concentrations.

Then let me go through a couple of questions which are related to that, and then maybe you can answer them. The

second question deals with the sampling of the ground water directly beneath the landfill. That's the area where you would expect the groundwater to become the most contaminated, and there's no sampling of that groundwater system directly below the landfill. And it would be interesting to know what that water quality is, because that's probably going to be the source of the plume that's going to be moving to the southwest from the landfill site. Eventually, that material, perhaps maybe not for ten years or so, may be getting into that area and, of course, that's why you're doing your monitoring.

Another aspect of this is what effect is pumping the wells in the vicinity at high rates going to have in attracting the plumes? What is the zone of capture, for instance, for the wells that are pumping there and servicing Amberton Village in the northeastern corner on the landfill, and what are some possibilities, if you did have other wells in the vicinity that were pumping at very much higher rates, that that would reverse the direction of flow of the plumes, and would those high pumping rates perhaps attract the contaminants in that direction? So maybe you could refer to some of them -- as I say, there's a number of questions, but they're related, so I thought --

MS. EVISON: Good questions. Let me start with the

first one. We were surprised when we sampled the landfill that the level of contaminants were fairly low. One answer is that our records or reports of the way the wastes were dumped in the landfill are that there were no discreet dumping areas for certain wastes, that as industrial wastes came in, they were disposed alongside of the household wastes in particular trenches, and then when that trench was full, they moved on to the next. And so it may be that the gross contaminants were disbursed enough that those high levels are just not very concentrated. Other than that, you know, some contaminants will degrade through time, and there has been, you know, some time since the landfill began. And some of the sources of industrial wastes, although they may have had some hazardous constituents, perhaps they weren't as concentrated as we had feared. Do you have anything else to add?

MS. BARTZ: No, not really. Again, we were really surprised that the groundwater contamination wasn't as high -- it was very low. We went out there -- instead of doing it in two phases -- a lot of times we'll go in and install monitoring wells in just the upper aquifer, and then, depending on those results, then we would go back and look at the bedrock. But we decided to drill as many wells as we could in one phase. I think if we had done it in a phased approach, we might have missed the bedrock, because

there wasn't much contamination in the unconsolidated sediments.

MS. EVISON: Let me go on to your second question about why we didn't drill deeper through the landfill. When we drilled to the landfill, we tried to stop right at the base of the waste. And the reason was that, although there is no liner, no artificially constructed liner in the landfill, there may be a layer of silts or clays underling some parts of the landfill that are helping to keep the waste in place, and if that's there, we certainly don't want to puncture it and allow further contamination into the groundwater.

However, we did encounter a small amount of groundwater at the very bottom of one of those holes through the waste, and that's the one where I showed that we found vinyl chloride, benzene and nickel slightly above drinking water standards. So even right under the landfill, it's not terribly contaminated. We did drill right off the edge of the landfill deeper, so that's as close as we could get safely. The last question about pumping rates; we didn't see any effect of the Amberton Village pumping wells on the shallow groundwater flow underneath the landfill. Those wells are enough deeper and are pumping at a rate that evidently is not affecting the flow where the contaminants are.

MS. BARTZ: They're 350 feet deep. The Amberton Village wells are 330 feet deep.

MR. TAYLOR: What's the pumping rate? I'd be interested in --

MS. BARTZ: Off the top of my head, I don't know, and I think it's cyclic. It's on an as-needed basis.

MS. EVISON: Most of the arsenic is at around a 50-foot depth in the shallow, fractured bedrock. If other wells were put in the area, you know, large wells pumping at high rates, it would be very important to look carefully at what effect that could have. If a water supply well were further away than the Amberton Village well and deep like the Amberton Village well, I wouldn't expect it to have any effect, but again, it's an important thing to look at.

MS. DERR: The Amberton Village wells are east of this landfill?

MS. EVISON: Right.

MS. DERR: Your flow is northeast to southwest. What about Orchard Knoll? Those wells are all contaminated?

MS. EVISON: Right now, at Orchard Knoll, there are contaminants that were discovered during sampling a few years ago. Now, in sampling that was done more recently, those contaminants have not been detected. But that area in Orchard Knoll is a little bit being affected by pumping

at McGraw-Edison, and if you remember --

(Overhead displayed to audience)

MS. BARTZ: Orchard Knoll doesn't show up very well in this figure. The Orchard Knoll subdivision; it's like right off of here; is that right? Can you see or not?

MS. DERR: I don't think it's that close to the highway. It's up behind that church. So it's farther down.

MS. BARTZ: Down in this area here? (indicating)

MS. DERR: It's down about where your first two dots are.

MS. EVISON: One of the things that we looked at carefully, to be sure that we were capturing -- that we knew about all the contamination that might be coming from this landfill. These green spots are the proposed locations for monitoring wells, and you notice that there's some off in this direction that are put here because we want to be sure that we're not missing any groundwater flow that's going up there, and that's especially a concern of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Did that answer your question, ma'am?

MS. DERR: (Nodding head in affirmative).

MS. EVISON: Did I answer what you wanted?

MS. DERR: Yes, that answers it.

MR. LOPEZ: Bob Lopez, Sheridan Township. I understand -- if I'm wrong, maybe someone can correct me -- that Orchard Knoll does have city water out there now.

MS. DERR: Yes, it does have it.

MR. LOPEZ: It does have that because of contaminants in that area. So I just wanted to make sure that's noted, because we have another Superfund site, not far from it. It's the Brooks, which hopefully was going to be approved for clean-up. I haven't heard yet.

MS. EVISON: What I was talking about was sampling of monitoring wells that are in place out there, and you may well be right about the residential wells.

MR. LOPEZ: I see.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: They're abandoned, and they've been hooked up.

MR. LANOUE: My name is Mike LaNoue, and I'm with a group called the Anti-Burn Coalition, and we're very concerned about this site and all the other Superfund sites in light of the fact that perhaps another Superfund site is going to be created here in Albion. There's a group that is proposing building an incinerator here in town, and, in essence, creating another toxic waste site. And the question was asked by the geologist, Mr. Taylor, and I'd like you to speak to this if you could, and it's been

raised that there are, you know, six Superfund sites, including this one, in the area. Now, this proposed incinerator has indicated that they might drill wells, large wells and pump as much as 600,000 to a million gallons of water per day. And we're all very concerned with the traveling of groundwater and contaminants in the area and the idea that the aquifer has arsenic and radon gas in it already, and we're wondering, can you speak to the other Superfund sites in the area like Airco Industrial Gases -- I'm sure you're familiar with that -- the Brooks Foundry, which has been mentioned, Mid-Michigan Metal Products and some of the other sites that are there with foundry sand and other contaminants. And also, I'd like to find out exactly how the -- I have a whole bunch of questions that I'd like to ask; that's one of them. You're proposing a clean-up of about between 4.3 and $6 million. Who's going to pay for it? I'd like to know that. I understand that the EPA is suing or has a suit on file in court right now -- is that correct? -- naming the city and Sheridan Township as responsible parties for this. And what's the status of that? I'd like to know about that. And I could ask a whole bunch more questions, but I think I've already taken up enough time.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Sir, you want to know about the other national priority listing sites?

MR. LANOUE: Yes. You know, this one, it's taken you five years to get to this one. How long is it going to take to get to the other one?

MS. VALETKEVITCH: So three questions. I think maybe we should get a clarification on how many Superfund sites. This is a Superfund site. A Superfund site is a site, a hazardous waste site, that is a priority to the federal government and to the states to get cleaned up. They're all across the country. And is this a Superfund site? I believe that -- help me out here.

MS. EVISON: McGraw-Edison is a Superfund site.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: What other ones?

MS. EVISON: None of the others are listed on the NPL. They may be state clean-up sites.

MR. LANOUE: No; they are EPA Superfund sites, Airco Industrial Gases, Brooks Foundry --

MS. EVISON: There may be something I'm not personally aware of. Brooks Foundry hasn't been listed on the NPL yet, but how I'd like to answer this is that I'm not the project manager for those sites, and I think your questions really should be answered by the people who know what's happening at those sites. And what I can do is get you the names and phone numbers of those people for each one that is an EPA Superfund site so that you can get questions directly to them.

MR. LANOUE: There are six EPA Superfund sites. Whether they're on the NPL at this stage or not, I'm not sure, but they have been identified as Superfund sites.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: We will get back to you on those other national priorities.

MR. LANOUE: Well, I'd like to know about the groundwater flow and so forth related to that. Can you speak to that? You're experts, and people here are interested. We've got a consultant here from Earth Tech who's also been hired by this organization that's proposing the incinerator, and, you know, it would be interesting to know.

MS. EVISON: I guess I'm not clear what the question is.

MR. LANOUE: Okay. Professor Taylor asked regarding the migration, what effect large pumping would have on the draw-down of the contaminants, and you could at least speak to this site. And we're talking about, you know, large pumping within about a half a mile of this site.

MS. EVISON: If someone proposed a pumping well which would interfere with a clean-up at a Superfund site, it would be a legal issue that we would take on, and, you know, it's something we'd be very concerned about.

MR. LANOUE: What would the ramifications of that be?

MS. EVISON: I really can't speculate. I know at some

sites, you know, there are limitations on people's actions because they're interfering with a clean-up.

MR. LANOUE: I see; okay. Good; thank you.

MS. BARTZ: Can I just speak a little bit more? We performed a model for the Albion-Sheridan Township Landfill site for modeling a pump and treat at the site. We did not model future scenarios such as if someone put a large well in surrounding the site. That was not part of our investigation because, as we were doing the site, those types of issues weren't coming up. And let me just speak a little bit more. The McGraw Company well, I believe, does have an influence that comes out to about here (indicating), so I'm not sure exactly what the gallonages are, what the depths of their wells are, but they are drawing ground water from here over, but they aren't drawing water from the Albion-Sheridan Township Landfill site.

MR. LANOUE: No; they have their own wells; right?

MS. BARTZ: Right, but I'm saying their well that they're pumping isn't influencing our groundwater flow.

MR. LANOUE: In this scenario?

MS. BARTZ: Well, not in scenario, but in actuality, right now.

MR. LANOUE: In terms of this Superfund site?

MS. BARTZ: Correct, which is what we were

investigating.

MR. LANOUE: You know, I want to apologize. I appreciate the thorough job that you've done in preparing on this one, but, you know, we're citizens, and we've got to look at the total picture. We can't just look at one Superfund site that you guys took five years to get around to having a public hearing on. Okay? We've got to look at everything. And, you know, the whole picture is important.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: You're right.

MR. BUINOWSKI: Vic Buinowski. I live on East Michigan Avenue just northwest a little bit of the dump site. Now, just west of me -- to begin with, a gentleman came from Chicago from the EPA about 2 1/2, 3 years ago to the house and asked me a bunch of questions, wanted to know if I could tell him anything that had been dumped in that site and anything else in some of these other areas that he's talking about, some of these other sites that have contamination, like the Brooks Foundry dump, just to the west of me, just about 150, 200 yards on the north side of Michigan Avenue. I'm sure you're aware of that.

I told him about another site right next door to the lumber yard. A lot of these people don't realize there's a dump site just to the east of the lumber yard. Brooks Foundry dumped a lot of dirt in there, and that was a deep hole in there at one time. Anyway, he asked me a bunch of

questions about that, and I told him what I thought had been dumped, what I'd seen. I've seen septic tanks dumped and stuff into the dump site and, like they say, plating sludge and stuff from Union Steel.

Also, in the Brooks Foundry dump site, they dumped a bulk station, the Sinclair Oil bulk station here on the corner of Michigan Avenue and Ionia Street. There was a big tank dumped in there, a gasoline tank that caught fire, and the whole business burned up, the whole bulk station. And the residue from the dirt and the ashes and everything, the drums and everything, was put into the Brooks Foundry dump site. And this gentleman was going to let me know -- I'm still on the mailing list, because I still get this stuff from him, but he never did go any further than that. I just wondered if you can't tell me anything that transpired in the meantime. This has been 2 years ago, 2 1/2 years ago that the man was there. I know he was a government man. He had a government license plate on his automobile. He said he was from Chicago.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: EPA's regional office is in Chicago, so it must have been someone from EPA. I don't know -- maybe if you could tell me the gentleman's name.

MR. BUINOWSKI: I looked today for his -- he gave me a card, but my sweetheart got rid of it.

MS. BARTZ: Well, the earlier community relations

coordinator, the person that was working on the site before Heidi, his name was Phillip Schutte.

MR. BUINOWSKI: No, that don't sound right.

MS. BARTZ: Okay. Because he did some interviews 2 1/2 years ago when we started on this.

MR. BUINOWSKI: This fellow had a "berg" or "stein" on the end of his name. Now, I could be wrong. He left me with the impression he might have been of Jewish ancestry or heritage.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: I don't know. I know that EPA employees go out, and they talk to residents --

MR. BUINOWSKI: Like this gentleman said, we have more than one or two sites here. We have six sites, that I know. Like he says, it's been five years for this one. What are we going to do with the rest of them? See, they were supposed to monitor this landfill, the state, whoever. And my complaint is -- I'm sorry; I want to apologize for that outburst to begin with, on that map.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: That's fine.

MR. BUINOWSKI: I just felt somebody wasn't doing their homework. Somebody's getting paid good money, and they come up with stuff like this. Well, I hate to criticize. I make mistakes myself. I'm not perfect. So I apologize for that, but -- I missed the point I was trying to make. Then they're coming in here with this

incinerator. Are they going to monitor a little bit better than they did this, or is it going to go on for three, four, five years and we end up with a mess again, with a disaster or something. I mean, I'm not against the incinerator personally, if they take care of it the way they're supposed to, but are they going to? This gentleman said they're going to bore some hole in there to drill 600,000 gallons of water to a million gallons of water a day, is it going to draw that stuff out of this landfill? Is it going to draw the stuff out of the Brooks Foundry dumps, the two dumps that I know of?

And you want to remember, in back of Brooks Foundry, at the same time, they dumped thousands of yards of dirt there, because that was a low spot. As a matter of fact, there's wetland back in there where they had cooling for their water. And all that in back of Brooks Foundry is filled in with foundry dirt. That must be 10, 12, 14 feet deep. Is that going to suck some of that water or contaminants, those wells out there? Like I say, it's got me concerned. I'm really worried about it.

MR. LOPEZ: Bob Lopez again, Sheridan Township. Correct me if I didn't hear you correctly. You have project managers for each of these little contaminant Superfund sites. Is there anyone in the EPA that has this all mapped out around Albion and say, "My gosh, we've got a

big thing here"?

MR. BUINOWSKI: Enough is enough.

MR. LOPEZ: Enough is enough, in other words.

MR. LANOUE: Love Canal.

MR. LOPEZ: And then putting this into perspective with regard to another industry that may be a thousand feet from Amberton Village that is projected to be pumping anywhere from 800,000 gallons of water -- a new pump, two wells -- to a million gallons of water a day, and that not being enough, also to tap into the City of Albion water, and there is great concern that migration will occur, because you also have, within that whole vicinity, maybe a thousand-feet radius or whatever -- or less than a half a mile, maybe -- you have the City of Albion water, the only existing "good" water, apparently, in quotations. And there's fear that it's on a shoestring right now that -- you know, let's pray and hope. And I've heard one comment from somebody that's not an expert that said, "Maybe if you have the water sucking over here on the outer areas, it will keep the migration from coming to that particular well where the city gets their water from." There's a lot of unknowns in this whole thing, and it's scary. It's very scary. Now, question back -- who is taking the responsibility for the whole area, because they're so darned close together. Who's doing that on the

EPA that we could contact that would take everything together and contact with all of these project managers so there's constant networking so each one knows what they are doing, because there's a totality here of a water problem. That's my concern. I don't know who does -- do you have an answer for that?

MS. EVISON: We are broken into geographic areas, and, you know, the group I work with is working on sites in Michigan. And, we do talk to each other. You know, unfortunately, we do tend to concentrate on our particular sites, but I think your issue is very important, that we need to be aware of the larger context. There are some areas where EPA has made a special effort to coordinate all of the sites. We have -- we call them geographic initiative areas. For example, the whole Detroit area of southwestern (sic) Michigan is being handled in that way, and the northwestern Indiana and adjacent Illinois area is being handled that way. So far, this area is not being handled that way.

MR. LOPEZ: And I'm concerned that it needs to be handled that way, because we do have a critical mass of pollutants and contaminants in this area, and that's why it's important to at least look at the statistics and see how we rank with other areas with regard to health issues.

MS. PENNOCK: I think this gentleman brought up the

cost and said that they may retrieve the costs from the responsible parties, but what happens if the "may" isn't there and they don't get it? Where do the Superfund monies come from?

MS. EVISON: What's going to happen at this site is that after we issue our decision about what the clean-up process should be, we'll begin notifying the responsible parties, the groups, the municipalities, the industries who are responsible for the contamination of the landfill. We'll begin negotiating with that group to come to an agreement for them to bear the clean-up costs. If we don't reach agreement, we may order the group to do the work, or Superfund may decide to pay for it themselves. So those are the three options.

MS. PENNOCK: Where does the Superfund money come from?

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Superfund comes from when we actually get parties to do the work and pay for the clean-up, and sometimes we go back and do something called a cost recovery, which is three times the amount of -- it can be up to three times the amount. It gets back to the fund -- extra money gets back to the fund, but I believe it's largely made up of a tax on chemical and oil companies and a small percentage of taxpayer dollars. So that's what Superfund is made up of. Can we have your name, ma'am?

MS. PENNOCK: Paula Pennock.

MR. DINENNY: My name is Robert Dinenny, and I'm a chemistry professor at Albion College. And as I read what was in the paper and what was picked up this evening, this meeting is to discuss the plan for what's going to happen for remediation of the Sheridan-Albion Landfill. I really resent certain people using this as a platform to submit all kinds of what-if's with regard to what might happen with the Albion Renewable Energy Project, and I think it's entirely out of place. It would be nice to do everything all at once. Unfortunately, it doesn't work that way. What we are here for tonight is to discuss the plan that EPA is proposing for remediation of the Sheridan-Albion Landfill, and any discussion that does not bear on that plan is not germane at this point.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Do we have any more questions? Do we have more questions?

MS. DIANICH: Helen Dianich. I'm a resident in Sheridan Township since 1946. I don't have a degree in chemistry. I am a concerned citizen. When this landfill that you're talking about tonight was being used, apparently there was no concern about health problems in relation to the landfill. What is your EPA department doing to prevent health problems from occurring in the future; that is, heavy industry locating in the area, using

huge amounts of water and permits being refused by EPA? I'm sorry, but I think this is a concern, and I think it can be aired tonight. I'm sorry it is a concern. I wish we didn't have it.

MS. EVISON: Many of the environmental issues are handled these days by the state. EPA gets involved with some permitting and with some clean-ups, like the Albion-Sheridan Landfill. I guess I'm a little unclear on the question, or would you like to make a comment for the record?

MS. DIANICH: Well, my question is, when this landfill was being used, I mean, there was no problem. How do we prevent problems from happening? That's my question.

MS. EVISON: At landfills that are operating today?

MS. DIANICH: Not necessarily a landfill.

MS. EVISON: Although there are a lot of problems, I do think there has been a lot of progress in environmental regulation and in the state of the industry. And I think it's important that communities stay very involved and vigilant. I think the level of knowledge about these things is much higher than it was in the past, and hopefully we will see a better future.

MS. BARTZ: The technology is much more advanced as well than in 1961 when this landfill opened.

MS. DIANICH: But like from 1994 to the next 20 years,

we're going to see another change, and that's what I'm talking about.

MR. LOPEZ: Your well was contaminated, wasn't it?

MS. DIANICH: Oh, our wells were contaminated; sure. We carried bottled water; just like going out and pumping it and -- I mean, it was no big deal, you know, if you had to carry water.

MR. MOORE: Ms. Chairwoman, could we get back on the subject, please?

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Do we have any more questions?

MR. LANOUE: You mentioned the geographic Michigan area, Detroit --

MS. VALETKEVITCH: There are three, actually, within the region. We cover six midwestern states.

MR. LANOUE: As a group of concerned citizens who are aware of more than one problem that exists -- very acutely aware of this one and appreciate the good work that you've done on this -- how would we go about seeking to create a geographic initiative area here in Albion to address the more acute needs that we have?

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Well, I think you started tonight. You made a public comment. I will bring that public comment to the geographic initiative coordinator who works in my office. His name is John Perconne. And I will talk with him about it, and maybe, if you'd like, I can have him

call you and talk about what he does and ways of forming more geographic initiatives. They don't only look at Superfund sites, but they look at air quality issues, and they look at all environmental issues within that one little area.

MR. LANOUE: Well, we've got, you know, air quality issues here in town, too. I know the EPA is monitoring Hayes-Albion, Harvard Industries and other sites, too. So we have -- I mean, our city has some acute environmental problems not unique to small towns with blue-collar industry but, nonetheless, serious problems that maybe if they were all being addressed, rather than piecemeal, you know, simultaneously, maybe we could really make some real progress.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Sir, do you have a question?

MR. PRALUS: Yeah. We live right in front of the dump right there, and the five acres they've got fenced in, why do they keep holding that back where we can't do nothing with it? It ain't no part of the dump.

MS. EVISON: This shows the approximate outline of the waste, the area that has waste underneath it. And the way we discovered that was by using geophysical instruments across the surface that detect what's underneath. And the fenced-in area -- Liz, can you show me where the fence is?

MS. BARTZ: I'm not sure if I'll draw it right. Is it

something like that?

MR. PRALUS: Well, it's right beside the house, right by the road.

MS. EVISON: The fence goes all the way up to the road and across even though the landfill itself is not right here, because when we're working on the landfill, we need an area, for example, to take contaminated water that we moved off-site for treatment, needed a flat area to work from. When the trucks were in here to dig the test pits, they needed a staging area to enter through that could be fenced off so that the public didn't come into contact with any of the wastes.

MR. PRALUS: Okay. So they're going to use that property. If they're going to use it, why don't they rent it? We own it. You guys don't own it. Okay? You won't let us use it. I cannot even set a trailer over there because you guys have got your stuff over there. If you can't find nowhere to, you know, put your stuff, why don't you start paying rent for where your stuff's at. You don't own it; we do.

MS. EVISON: I think what I'd like to do is get you in contact with our attorney, Barbara Wester, and I can give you her phone number after the meeting.

MR. PRALUS: Well, if you don't want to pay rent, why don't you just buy it. Okay? That makes it even better,

because you don't own it. Your name's not on the deed. You have not got rights to take up the land. It's not yours; it's ours.

MS. EVISON: That's a very legitimate concern, and I do think it should be taken up with us formally.

MR. PRALUS: It's not on the dump, they won't let me set a trailer on it. Okay? I don't see why not, because it's not in the drinking water. They check our drinking water all the time, and it's not in it, so why can't we set a trailer there? If they're going to use it, I think they ought to pay rent. They even told us -- they fenced it in and told us that we could not have a key to get inside there, but they finally give us a key, because that's our land, and they keep us off of it.

MS. EVISON: That's right. We've given keys to the property owners that need access to their property on the landfill, but we encourage them not to go inside the fence because of the hazards that are in there.

MR. PRALUS: And they went in there, and they buckled the septic tank that was on there. They're supposed to fix it; ain't been fixed yet. So what's going on there?

MS. EVISON: I encourage you to -- could we get together right after the meeting to get your phone number?

MR. PRALUS: They've got it.

MS. EVISON: I'd like to get you in touch with Barbara

Wester.

MR. BUINOWSKI: You've got to admit that we do have a problem with this landfill. That's why we're going to spend 600,000 or a million or a million and eight tenths or whatever. Now, what my question is, being that I live -- I'm surrounded by this stuff -- and it is pertinent, sir, regardless of what you say -- what are the responsible people, the people that's supposed to be doing the job, going to do to monitor any other project that comes in there properly? And if you talk about technology, I'll grant you, more sophistication; wonderful. But we killed more Americans in Desert Storm with our sophisticated lasers and our planes than we killed Iraqis. Saddam Hussein is still alive and well. So you can talk all you want about technology. We have mistakes and we have disasters. We have people killed. What are we going to do? Can anybody tell me? Are we going to do a better job, or are we just going to let the next place come in there and the same thing happen over again; the landfill, Brooks Foundry, all these dumps? You have McGraw-Edison. That's pertinent, sir. I live there.

AUDIENCE: You're living back in the 1950's, Vic.

MR. BUINOWSKI: You're damned right, and I'd rather live back in the 1930's.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: I think we're going to have to

start public comments now, if you don't have any more questions. Do you have a public comment?

MS. WHITTUM: Virginia Whittum. I would like to know, when you pick this stuff up, where are you going to put it?

MS. EVISON: We're not proposing to remove most of the waste in the landfill. We're only proposing to remove about 200 drums. Is that what you're talking about?

MS. WHITTUM: I'm talking about -- well, you're going to clean it up, aren't you?

MS. EVISON: Our proposal for the mass of the landfill is to leave it where it is, protect it with a sophisticated cap of -- a fancy plastic top with cover soils and sand and gas collection so that the waste would stay there but not leach contaminants into the groundwater.

MS. WHITTUM: Something about the environment and how much problems we have with it; I think industry ought to wake up. They're not being like they should be and caring, and I don't think the people should have to put up with this kind of thing, really; their water, have to buy water. And it's really ridiculous. It's a ridiculous thing to happen. Our grandfathers wouldn't have that. They had more common sense than they do now.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Another public comment?

MR. LANOUE: Yeah; Mike LaNoue. I was wondering; how much did the EPA pay to have the preliminary studies done

by Earth Tech, the consultant?

MS. EVISON: The contract amount, I haven't put together a list of the total cost to date. We allocated, I believe, $1.1 million for the process from the beginning through the Record of Decision, which will be this winter. I don't know that we're going to spend all of that, but that is the ballpark range of what the investigation and the feasibility study and the risk assessment cost. It's very detailed work.

MS. PENNOCK: Are we supposed to just vote now if we want to do this the way you are recommending or --

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Well, how it works is that we take your public comments, we consider them as well as the eight other criteria that are listed in the proposed plan fact sheet, and after considering all comments and taking into consideration past studies and such, the regional administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, at EPA, will make a decision, based on all that information, on which alternative to select.

MS. DIANICH: And what's his name?

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Valdas Adamkus, from Chicago.

MS. DERR: Now, you said there are regions. What region are we?

MS. VALETKEVITCH: You're Region 5, and your base is in Chicago. There are nine regions throughout the country

for EPA. Are there any other comments?

MR. LAMPART: Kenneth Lampart, Parma Township, Amberton Village, and that's Jackson County. We're right next to the dump site, or the back of the village is. I'm concerned, and from what you say, the wells in Amberton Village are okay, but is there anybody that worked at the dump that recorded any illnesses in the past? And there's probably a lot of people in the community that's used the dump site. At one time, the dump was just a dust bowl, so the dust went all over. If the site is as hazardous as you say it is, in this blue paper, that should have been out with the one that you mailed to us, it's a wonder that Erie Road hasn't washed away. And the fenced-in area, I ain't sure exactly how far that extends, but a neighbor told me that it's open in the back or something or other, and kids can get in there and play.

MS. EVISON: The fence extends all the way around the landfill and has locked gates at either end. If anyone sees the gate open, please call any of the phone numbers listed in the fact sheet, and we'll get it locked up again right away. Those gates should never be open.

MR. LAMPART: She was just saying that it was a hole somebody could walk through or something.

MS. EVISON: We did find a couple of times during the past year or two, holes cut in the fence which we repaired

as soon as we found them. And if you see that, we want to know about it.

MR. LAMPART: And you could put larger signs up that say "danger," and I wouldn't find it inadvisable to extend the fence, theoretically. It should be beyond the dump site, because they didn't just contain it in one area. I'm sure when the dump was going on, they was pushing the landfill all over the place.

MS. EVISON: I think through our studies we've been able to pretty accurately outline the area that has waste in it, and we did sample soils in the surrounding area and found a few contaminants at very low levels. So, basically, we did not find a problem with soils off-site.

MR. LAMPART: But you said your low levels were above average.

MR. MOORE: That's not what she said.

MS. EVISON: I don't think so.

MR. LAMPART: For the federal drinking standards.

MS. EVISON: The groundwater beneath the landfill exceeds the federal drinking water standards. The soil is at a very low risk.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Any other comments?

MR. LOPEZ: Reclamation of the land; what are the plans for that once you do all this? It sounds like no one can build on this or use it for any purpose until 15 years

or something. Is that what I'm hearing you say, or is there a plan that as long as you have water piped into the area close by, that that land can be used for certain types of businesses? Is that a possibility?

MS. EVISON: Yeah, I think that is a possibility. What's most important is that that groundwater that has arsenic which exceeds drinking water standards is not used for drinking. And that's one of the things we're going to be looking at very closely in the next couple months is to figure out how do we make sure that happens? How do we make sure that people don't drink that water?

MS. VALETKEVITCH: So, most likely, it will be some sort of future land use restriction.

MR. LOPEZ: That's what I mean.

MS. EVISON: But as far as using the surface of the land away from the landfill, I don't know of any problems with that.

MR. PRALUS: So what you're more or less saying is that I could sit a trailer on that five acres as long as I'm tapping into the house well?

MS. EVISON: I think the area that's inside the fence now, we should talk afterwards, because it's a complicated issue, and I'd like to talk one on one about that.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Well, if there are no further questions or comments, we will -- there is one?

MS. DERR: Who owns the land where the landfill is except this young man?

MS. EVISON: The State of Michigan owns the rest of the landfill land.

MR. LOPEZ: Do they own it because of back taxes?

MS. EVISON: Uh-huh (affirmative).

MR. LOPEZ: And if anyone had the nerve to buy it, they could when it's cleaned up or what?

MS. EVISON: That's a legal issue.

MR. LOPEZ: That's a legal issue; okay.

MS. VALETKEVITCH: Okay. Well, we'll hang around and answer any questions if you want to talk to us one on one. Thank you all for coming.

(Off the record)

MR. LANOUE: I'm Mike LaNoue, Albion. I'd just like to say that I think the EPA did an excellent job in terms of focusing on the problems of the Sheridan-Albion Landfill, and I appreciate the work that was done. My concern is that we have a number of Superfund sites in the area, and we'd like them all addressed simultaneously, if they could be, to clear the community of these problems at a more speedy rate. But I think the work that was done by the EPA was very thorough and very professional, and I want to thank the EPA for their work.

-0-0-0-

RECORDER'S CERTIFICATE AND NOTARIZATION

I, Susan J. Warner, Court Recorder, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of the electronic recording made and recorded at the time and place of the above hearing, and is all of the same so far as pertains thereto.

Susan J. Warner

Susan J. Warner, CER-1386
Notary Public
My commission expires 03-16-96